arXiv:1401.3086v1 [math.GR] 14 Jan 2014

A CLASS OF SEMIPRIMITIVE GROUPS THAT ARE GRAPH-RESTRICTIVE

MICHAEL GIUDICI AND LUKE MORGAN

Abstract. We prove that an infinite family of semiprimitive groups are graph-restrictive. This adds to the evidence for the validity of the PSV Conjecture and increases the minimal imprimitive degree for which this conjecture is open to 12. Our result can be seen as a generalisation of the well-known theorem of Tutte on cubic graphs. The proof uses the amalgam method, adapted to this new situation.

1. Introduction

A famous theorem of Tutte says that in every group that acts faithfully and arc-transitively on a finite connected cubic graph, the order of a vertex stabiliser divides 48. We shall prove a generalisation of Tutte's theorem which holds for infinite families of graphs with valencies powers of three. To state our result, we must introduct some terminology. For a vertex x of a graph Γ we write $\Gamma(x)$ for the set of neighbours of x and $G_x^{\Gamma(x)}$ for the permutation group induced by the stabiliser G_x of x on $\Gamma(x)$. Let L be a permutation group and let Γ be a connected graph with vertex-transitive group of automorphisms G such that $|G_x|$ is finite for all vertices x. If for $x \in \Gamma$ there is a permutation isomorphism $G_x^{\Gamma(x)} \cong L$ we say that the pair (Γ, G) is *locally* L. Following [27], if there is a constant C such that for every locally L pair (Γ, G) we have $|G_x| \leqslant C$, we say that L is *graph-restrictive*. Our generalisation is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let L be the Frobenius group of order $2 \cdot 3^n$ and degree 3^n with elementary abelian Frobenius kernel. Then L is graph-restrictive.*

In the language introduced above, Tutte's seminal work on cubic arc-transitive graphs [25, 26] asserts that C_3 and Sym(3) are graph-restrictive (as subgroups of Sym(3)). In the same vein, Gardiner [3] showed that any transitive subgroup of Sym(4) other than Dih(8) is graph-restrictive, while Sami [11] showed that any dihedral group of odd degree is as well. We extend our terminology to describe these situations. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a property of permutation groups (such as transitive) and let Γ be a connected graph with vertex-transitive group of automorphisms G. We say that the pair (Γ, G) is locally $\mathcal{P}$ if the permutation group $G_x^{\Gamma(x)}$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}$.

Motivated by the above results, particular attention has been paid to studying the structure of vertex stabilisers in locally primitive graphs. A transitive permutation group

This research forms part of an Australian Research Council Discovery Project (project number DP120100446).

on a set Ω is called *primitive* if it preserves no nontrivial partitions of Ω. A difficult and long-standing conjecture of Weiss [28] asserts that primitive permutation groups are graph-restrictive. It follows from work of Trofimov and Weiss (see [23, Theorem 1.4]) that the Weiss Conjecture is true for the subclass of 2-transitive groups. This required a deep theorem of Trofimov (see [15], [16], [17, 18] and [19, 20, 21, 22]) dealing with the case of permutation groups with socle $\mathrm{PSL}_n(q)$ in a doubly transitive action. In joint work Trofimov and Weiss [23, 24] have shown that the Weiss Conjecture holds for permutation groups with socle $\mathrm{PSL}_n(q)$ acting on subspaces. Praeger, Spiga and Verret [9] reduced the truth of the Weiss Conjecture to a question about simple groups and Praeger, Pyber, Spiga and Szabó [8] subsequently showed that it is true for locally primitive pairs (Γ, G) where the composition factors of G have bounded rank.

A natural question is the following: what is the correct context for graph-restrictive permutation groups and the Weiss Conjecture? A permutation group is called *quasiprimitive* if every nontrivial normal subgroup is transitive. This class of groups includes all primitive groups and Praeger generalised the Weiss conjecture to quasiprimitive permutation groups [7]. Potočnik, Spiga and Verret [10] have shown that if a transitive permutation group L is graph-restrictive then it is *semiprimitive*, that is, every normal subgroup of L is either transitive or semiregular. This led the authors to make the PSV Conjecture: a transitive permutation group is graph-restrictive if and only if it is semiprimitive. In later work of the second and third authors it was shown that intransitive permutation groups are graph-restrictive if and only if they are semiregular [14].

The class of semiprimitive groups includes the classes of primitive, quasiprimitive and Frobenius groups. Recently this class was studied by Bereczky and Maróti [1] due to a connection with collapsing monoids. We note that our definition follows [10] (as opposed to [1]) by including all regular groups as semiprimitive groups. There is an easy argument to show that regular groups are graph-restrictive. As part of their investigations, Potočnik, Spiga and Verret showed that the action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(p)$ on the set of nontrivial vectors of a 2-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}_p$ are graph-restrictive. They also showed that all semiprimitive groups of degree at most 8 are graph-restrictive. One group whose status was left open in [10] is the Frobenius group $3^2{:}2$ acting on 9 points (which fails to be quasiprimitive). Investigating this group is a natural extension of the work of Tutte on the group $\mathrm{Sym}(3) = 3{:}2$ and was seen as a natural test case for how methods used for primitive groups could be extended to semiprimitive groups. Our theorem therefore deals with the least degree imprimitive open case listed in [10] and pushes the degree of the smallest imprimitive unknown case to 12 (although there is still one primitive group of degree 9 and one of degree 10 listed in [10] for which the conjecture is unknown).

One important tool when studying the structure of vertex-stabilisers in vertex-transitive graphs is the so-called Thompson-Wielandt Theorem. First repurposed for the locally primitive situation by Gardiner [3, (2.3)], a generalisation due to Spiga [13] shows that in a locally semiprimitive pair (Γ, G) there exists a prime p such that $G_{uv}^{[1]}$ is a p-group for each arc (u, v) of Γ. Another important tool has been the amalgam method which goes back to Goldschmidt [4]. Since this there have been many successful applications, notably in [2]

where the method was refined. In contrast to our setting, for most of the cases considered in [2] the action is locally 2-transitive, therefore rather stronger than locally semiprimitive. The proof of our theorem relies upon extending the amalgam method to the semiprimitive group 3^n:2. What enables us to make progress in this new situation is a consideration of block systems for the local action. This, together with a modification of an an argument of Weiss [29], presented in Lemma 3.11, shows that a bound on the so-called critical distance in the amalgam method will show that the group L is graph-restrictive. For an introduction to the amalgam method we refer the reader to [5, 10.3].

Acknowledgements: The authors thank Gabriel Verret and Pablo Spiga for reading an early version of the paper and providing useful comments.

2. Preliminaries

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $L \cong 3^n{:}\mathrm{C}_2$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Assume that $n \geqslant 2$ so that L acts faithfully and imprimitively on the n-dimensional vector space V over $\mathbb{F}_3$. All proper normal subgroups of L are elementary abelian of order 3^m for some m and so are semiregular. Thus L is semiprimitive. Blocks of imprimitivity for L on V arise from translates of subspaces. Note that the point stabilisers are the Sylow 2-subgroups of L and the stabiliser of a block of size three is isomorphic to Sym(3).

Proposition 2.1. *For each basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V we have $L = \langle L_0, L_w \mid w \in \mathcal{B}\rangle$.*

Proof. For $w \in \mathcal{B}$ we note that $\langle L_0, L_w\rangle = L_{\langle w\rangle}$, the stabiliser of the block $\{0, w, -w\}$, and so is isomorphic to Sym(3). The translation by w is thus contained in $L_{\langle w\rangle}$, and therefore

$$\langle L_0, L_w \mid w \in \mathcal{B}\rangle$$

contains the Sylow 3-subgroup of L and we are done. □

Now we assemble some facts concerning $\mathbb{F}_2$-modules for L.

Proposition 2.2. *There is a bijection between the sets of irreducible $\mathbb{F}_2$-modules for L and for $\mathrm{O}_3(L)$. Moreover, the nontrivial irreducible $\mathbb{F}_2$-modules for L have dimension two and if $t \in \mathrm{O}_3(L)$ and V is a non-trivial irreducible $\mathbb{F}_2L$-module, either $[t, V] = 1$ or t is fixed point free on V.*

Proof. Observe that there are the same number of modules in each set and each irreducible $\mathbb{F}_2L$-module restricts to an irreducible $\mathbb{F}_2\mathrm{O}_3(L)$-module. The nontrivial irreducible modules all have dimension 2, therefore the moreover part of the proposition follows. □

The following can be found as part of [5, 8.2.7 and 8.4.2].

Lemma 2.3 (Coprime Action)**.** *Let G and V be finite groups. Suppose that G acts on V and $(|G|, |V|) = 1$. Then the following hold.*

(a) $[V, G, G] = [V, G]$.
(b) *If V is abelian then $V = C_V(G) \times [V, G]$.*

3. Amalgam method

Let L be the group defined in Theorem 1.1 and assume that Γ is a connected graph with an arc-transitive group G of automorphisms so that (Γ, G) is locally L. We may assume that Γ is a tree [12, Chapter 1, §4] and by Tutte's Theorem that $n \geqslant 2$. For adjacent vertices x and y of Γ, we define $G_x^{[1]}$ to be the kernel of the action of G_x on $\Gamma(x)$ and

$$G_{xy}^{[1]} = G_x^{[1]} \cap G_y^{[1]},$$

the kernel of the action of $G_x \cap G_y$ on $\Gamma(x) \cup \Gamma(y)$.

The following lemma is central to arguments involving the amalgam method.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $e = \{x, y\}$ be an edge of Γ and suppose that $K \leqslant G_x \cap G_y$. If either (a) or (b) below hold, then $K = 1$.*

(a) *$N_{G_x}(K)$ and $N_{G_y}(K)$ are transitive on $\Gamma(x)$ and $\Gamma(y)$ respectively.*
(b) *$N_{G_x}(K)$ is transitive on $\Gamma(x)$ and $N_{G_e}(K) \not\leqslant G_x \cap G_y$.*

Proof. Suppose that (a) holds and set $H = \langle \mathrm{N}_{G_x}(K), \mathrm{N}_{G_y}(K) \rangle \leqslant \mathrm{N}_G(K)$. Since Γ is connected, H acts edge-transitively. Let u be any vertex of Γ and let v be adjacent to u. Then there exists $h \in H$ such that $\{x, y\}^h = \{u, v\}$. Now we obtain

$$K = K^h \leqslant (G_x \cap G_y)^h = G_u \cap G_v \leqslant G_u$$

whence K fixes every vertex of Γ, and therefore $K = 1$. The case that (b) holds is similar and is omitted. □

We fix an edge $e = \{x, y\}$. Note that by edge-transitivity statements proved about the edge e apply to arbitrary edges. We may assume $G_{xy}^{[1]} \neq 1$.

Lemma 3.2. *The group G_e is a 2-group, $G_e/G_{xy}^{[1]} \cong \mathrm{Dih}(8)$ and $G_x^{[1]} G_y^{[1]} = G_x \cap G_y$.*

Proof. Since $G_{xy}^{[1]} \neq 1$ we have $G_x^{[1]} \neq 1$ and so $G_x^{[1]} \neq G_y^{[1]}$ by Lemma 3.1. Then as $|(G_x \cap G_y)/G_x^{[1]}| = 2$ we have $G_x^{[1]} G_y^{[1]} = G_x \cap G_y$ and $(G_x \cap G_y)/G_{xy}^{[1]}$ is elementary abelian of order four. Moreover, there is $t \in G_e - G_x \cap G_y$ which swaps $G_x^{[1]}$ and $G_y^{[1]}$ and $|G_e/G_{xy}^{[1]}| = 8$ hence $G_e/G_{xy}^{[1]} \cong \mathrm{Dih}(8)$.

The previous paragraph shows that for any prime $r \neq 2$ we have $\mathrm{Syl}_r(G_{xy}^{[1]}) = \mathrm{Syl}_r(G_x^{[1]})$. Taking $S \in \mathrm{Syl}_r(G_x^{[1]})$ the Frattini argument gives $G_x = \mathrm{N}_{G_x}(S) G_x^{[1]}$ and $G_e = \mathrm{N}_{G_e}(S) G_{xy}^{[1]}$. In particular $\mathrm{N}_{G_x}(S)$ is transitive on $\Gamma(x)$ and $\mathrm{N}_{G_e}(S) \not\leqslant G_{xy}^{[1]}$. Now Lemma 3.1 gives $S = 1$. □

For an edge $\{u, w\}$ of Γ we define the following subgroups:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_v &= G_v^{[1]}, \\ Z_{uw} &= \Omega_1(Z(G_u \cap G_w)), \\ Z_u &= \langle Z_{uw}^{G_u} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\Omega_1(P) = \langle x \mid x^p = 1 \rangle$ for a p-group P and note that since $G_u \cap G_w$ is a 2-group we have $Z_{uw} \neq 1$.

Proposition 3.3. $Z_x \leqslant \Omega_1(\mathrm{Z}(Q_x))$.

Proof. Since $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x) \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{G_x}(G_{xy}^{[1]})$ and $G_{xy}^{[1]}$ is a nontrivial normal subgroup of G_e, by Lemma 3.1(b) we have that $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x)$ is intransitive on $\Gamma(x)$. Since $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x) \trianglelefteq G_x$ it follows that $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x)$ is semiregular on $\Gamma(x)$ and so $2 \nmid |\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x) : \mathrm{C}_{Q_x}(Q_x)|$. In particular, $\mathrm{Z}(Q_x)$ is a Sylow 2-subgroup of $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Q_x)$. We have that $[Q_x, Z_{xy}] \leqslant [G_x \cap G_y, Z(G_x \cap G_y)] = 1$ so that Z_{xy} centralises Q_x and therefore $Z_{xy} \leqslant \mathrm{Z}(Q_x)$. By the definition of Z_{xy} we get $Z_{xy} \leqslant \Omega_1(\mathrm{Z}(Q_x))$. Since $\Omega_1(\mathrm{Z}(Q_x))$ is a characteristic subgroup of Q_x and G_x normalises Q_x, we obtain the result. □

The following diagram helps keep track of the subgroups defined so far.



Proposition 3.4. *The group $C_{G_x}(Z_x)$ is intransitive on $\Gamma(x)$. Moreover, Q_x is a Sylow 2-subgroup of $C_{G_x}(Z_x)$.*

Proof. Since Z_{xy} is a non-trivial subgroup of $G_x \cap G_y$ which is normalised by $\langle \mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Z_x), G_e \rangle$, the first part of the proposition holds by Lemma 3.1(b). For the second part, since the action of G_x on $\Gamma(x)$ is semiprimitive, we have that $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(Z_x) \cap (G_x \cap G_y) = Q_x$. Now the claim follows since $G_x \cap G_y$ is a Sylow 2-subgroup of G_x. □

Now since Z_x is non-trivial, there exists $v \in \Gamma$ such that $Z_x \not\leqslant G_v^{[1]}$. We set

$$b = \min_{v \in \Gamma} \{ \mathrm{d}(x, v) \mid Z_x \not\leqslant G_v^{[1]} \},$$

the parameter b is called the *critical distance*. Note that by vertex-transitivity, it suffices to "measure" the critical distance at x. Our goal is to bound b; we will see in Lemma 3.11 that this enables us to bound the order of G_x.

The set of *critical pairs* is

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ (u, v) \mid \mathrm{d}(u, v) = b \text{ and } Z_u \not\leqslant G_v^{[1]} \}.$$

Examining the elements of $\mathcal{C}$ allows us to prove that a bound on b exists.

Proposition 3.5. *If $(x, v) \in \mathcal{C}$ then $(v, x) \in \mathcal{C}$.*



FIGURE 1. Some inclusions of subgroups

Proof. Suppose that $Z_v \leqslant G_x^{[1]}$. Then Proposition 3.3 implies that $[Z_v, Z_x] = 1$. Let w be the unique vertex in $\Gamma(v)$ with $\mathrm{d}(x, w) = \mathrm{d}(x, v) - 1$, by the minimality of b we have $Z_x \leqslant G_w^{[1]}$ which gives $Z_x \leqslant G_{vw} \leqslant G_v$. Now $Z_x \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{G_v}(Z_v)$ which by Proposition 3.4 has unique Sylow 2-subgroup Q_v. This implies $Z_x \leqslant Q_v$, a contradiction to $(x, v) \in \mathcal{C}$. □

Fix critical pair $(x, v) \in \mathcal{C}$. We write the (unique) path between x and v as

$$(x, x+1, x+2, \ldots, v-2, v-1, v).$$

We may assume that $y = x + 1$ by arc-transitivity. The following diagram shows some inclusions between the subgroups we have defined so far.

Proposition 3.6. *The following hold.*

(i) $|Z_x Q_v / Q_v| = 2 = |Z_v Q_x / Q_x|$, $G_{v-1} \cap G_v = Z_x Q_v$ *and* $G_x \cap G_{x+1} = Z_v Q_x$.
(ii) $|Z_x / C_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| = 2$.
(iii) $Z_{xx+1} = C_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})$.
(iv) $|Z_x / Z_{xx+1}| = 2 = |Z_x Z_{x+1} / Z_x|$.

Proof. Part (i) follows from $|(G_x \cap G_{x+1})/Q_x| = 2$. For part (ii) we use part (i) to see that $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(Z_v Q_x) = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(Z_v)$. Since $Z_x \leqslant Q_{v-1} \leqslant G_v$ we have $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(Z_v) = Z_x \cap \mathrm{C}_{G_v}(Z_v)$. By Proposition 3.4, Q_v is the unique Sylow 2-subgroup of $\mathrm{C}_{G_v}(Z_v)$, so we obtain $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(Z_v) = Z_x \cap Q_v$, and by (i) we have $|Z_x/(Z_x \cap Q_v)| = 2$.

Clearly $Z_{xx+1} \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})$. Since $Z_x \leqslant G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ we have $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) = Z_x \cap \mathrm{Z}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})$. By Proposition 3.3, Z_x is elementary abelian, and so

$$Z_x \cap \mathrm{Z}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) \leqslant \Omega_1(\mathrm{Z}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) = Z_{xx+1}.$$

Part (iv) then follows from (ii) and (iii). □

Lemma 3.7. *There is exactly one non-central G_x-chief factor in Z_x and $C_{Z_x}(G_x) = C_{Z_x}(T)$ for $T \in \mathrm{Syl}_3(G_x)$.*

Proof. Let m be the number of non-central G_x-chief factors in Z_x. Let $T \in \mathrm{Syl}_3(G_x)$. Since T is transitive on $\Gamma(x)$, Proposition 3.4 implies that $[T, Z_x] \neq 1$ and since T acts coprimely on Z_x, it follows that $m \geqslant 1$. Since $TQ_x \lhd G_x$ (it has index two), we have that $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(TQ_x) = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)$ is G_x-invariant. Thus we may take the series $1 \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x) \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T) \leqslant Z_x$ and refine it to a G_x-chief series. Since the action is coprime $Z_x/\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)$ is completely reducible as a T-module and contains no central T-chief factors, therefore no central G_x-chief factors. Note that by Proposition 2.2 each non-central G_x-chief factor has order 2^2. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.3, TQ_x centralises $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)$, and so $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)/\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$ is just a module for $G_x/TQ_x \cong \mathrm{C}_2$. Hence every G_x-chief factor in $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)$ is central. The following diagram therefore describes the structure of Z_x.



Set $Z_0 = Z_x$ and $Z_m = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)$ and define the series

$$Z_m \leqslant Z_{m-1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant Z_1 \leqslant Z_0$$

so that each Z_i/Z_{i+1} is a G_x-chief factor. For $i \in [0, m)$, set $\overline{Z_i} = Z_i/Z_{i+1}$. Since $G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ is a 2-group, $\mathrm{C}_{\overline{Z_i}}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) \neq 1$. On the other hand, $G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ cannot centralise $\overline{Z_i}$ since $\mathrm{C}_{G_x}(\overline{Z_i})$ is a normal subgroup of G_x containing Q_x, so $G_x \cap G_{x+1} \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{G_x}(\overline{Z_i})$ implies that $G_x = \mathrm{C}_{G_x}(\overline{Z_i})$ which is against $\overline{Z_i}$ being a non-central G_x-chief factor. Hence for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant m-1$ we have $|\overline{Z_i}/\mathrm{C}_{\overline{Z_i}}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| = 2$. Now $|Z_x : \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| = 2$ by Proposition 3.6 (ii). So (by [6, Lemma 2.21]) we have that

$$2 = |Z_x/\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| \geqslant \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} |\overline{Z_i}/\mathrm{C}_{\overline{Z_i}}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| = 2^m$$

which gives $m \leqslant 1$. Since $G_x = T(G_x \cap G_{x+1})$ we have

$$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)}(G_x \cap G_{x+1}) = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x).$$

Now we see that

$$2 \geqslant |\overline{Z_0}/\mathrm{C}_{\overline{Z_0}}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})||\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)/\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)}(G_x \cap G_{x+1})| = 2|\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)/\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)|$$

which gives the result. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $T \in \mathrm{Syl}_3(G_x)$ and let $T_0 \leqslant T$ such that $C_{Z_x}(T) < C_{Z_x}(T_0)$. Then $[T_0, Z_x] = 1$.*

Proof. Set $W = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T_0)$ and suppose that $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T) < W$. Now $\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T) < W \leqslant Z_x$. Since $|Z_x/\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T)| = 2^2$, by Lemma 3.7 and Proposition 2.2, we see that either $W = Z_x$ (and we are done) or $|Z_x : W| = 2$. Since T_0 acts on Z_x/W it must centralise Z_x/W, which implies $[Z_x, T_0] \leqslant W = \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T_0)$. Now coprime action gives

$$[Z_x, T_0] = [Z_x, T_0, T_0] \leqslant [\mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(T_0), T_0] = 1.$$

□

Remark 3.9. Let r be a vertex of Γ. For each $t \in \Gamma(r)$ we may identify $\Gamma(r)$ with V so that t is identified with the zero vector. For $s \in \Gamma(r)$ distinct from t, we see that $\langle G_r \cap G_t, G_r \cap G_s\rangle/Q_r$ is generated by two involutions, and so is isomorphic to Sym(3). Therefore, by Proposition 2.1, for every basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V we have

$$\langle G_r \cap G_t, G_r \cap G_s \mid s \in \mathcal{B}\rangle = G_r.$$

For $(r, s) \in \mathcal{C}$ with the (unique) path between r and s being $(r, r+1, \ldots, s-1, s)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{-1}(r, s) &= \{y \in \Gamma(r) \setminus \{r+1\} \mid (y, s-1) \in \mathcal{C}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(r, s) &= \{y \in \Gamma(r) \setminus \{r+1\} \mid (y, s-1) \notin \mathcal{C}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and note that $\Gamma(r) = \{r+1\} \cup \mathcal{C}_{-1}(r, s) \cup \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(r, s)$. The composition of the defined sets plays a prominent role in the proof of the next theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *We have $b \leqslant 2$.*

Proof. We assume for a contradiction that $b > 2$. Figure 1 will be helpful in recognising various inclusions of subgroups throughout the proof.

The assumption implies that $Z_x \leqslant Q_{x+1}$, so in particular, Z_x normalises Z_{x+1} (and vice versa) and $Z_x Z_{x+1}$ is a subgroup of $G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ normalised by G_e.

(1) Z_v fixes setwise $\mathcal{C}_{-1}(x, v)$ and $\mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x, v)$.

Since $Z_v \leqslant G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ and $Z_v \not\leqslant Q_x$, certainly Z_v induces an involution on the set $\Gamma(x) \setminus \{x+1\}$. Now since $Z_v \leqslant Q_v \leqslant G_v \cap G_{v-1}$ normalises Q_{v-1}, for any $a \in Z_v$ and $t \in \Gamma(x) \setminus \{x+1\}$ we have that $Z_t \leqslant Q_{v-1}$ if and only if $(Z_t)^a = Z_{t^a} \leqslant Q_{v-1}$, that is, $t \in \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x, v)$ if and only if $t^a \in \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x, v)$.

(2) Suppose $t \in \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x, v)$. Then $Z_t Z_x = Z_x Z_{x+1}$.

We have $Z_t \leqslant Q_{v-1} \leqslant G_{v-1} \cap G_v = Z_x Q_v \leqslant Z_x \mathrm{C}_{G_v}(Z_v)$ by Propositions 3.6(i) and 3.4. Thus $[Z_t, Z_v] \leqslant [Z_x, Z_v]$ and since $Z_v \leqslant G_x$ it follows that $[Z_x, Z_v] \leqslant Z_x \leqslant Z_t Z_x$, so Z_v normalises $Z_t Z_x$. Hence $Z_v Q_x = G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ (by Proposition 3.6(i)) normalises $Z_t Z_x$ and so does $G_t \cap G_x$. Since

$$H := \langle G_t \cap G_x, G_x \cap G_{x+1}\rangle$$

normalises $Z_t Z_x$ and induces a Sym(3) on $\Gamma(x)$ which contains an element h interchanging t and $x+1$, we have $Z_t Z_x = (Z_t Z_x)^h = Z_{x+1} Z_x$.

For the next two claims we use Remark 3.9, identifying $\Gamma(x)$ with V so that $x+1$ is identified with the zero vector.

(3) There are no bases contained in $\mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x,v)$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{B}$ is a basis of V contained in $\mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x,v)$. We have

$$G_x = \langle G_x \cap G_{x+1}, G_r \cap G_x \mid r \in \mathcal{B} \rangle.$$

For each $r \in \mathcal{B}$ the previous claim implies $Z_{x+1}Z_x = Z_xZ_r$ and so $1 \neq Z_{x+1}Z_x$ is normalised by $\langle G_x, G_e \rangle$, a contradiction to Lemma 3.1.

(4) $\mathcal{C}_{-1}(x,v)$ contains a basis.

Let W be the subspace of V generated by the vectors in $\mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x,v)$. The previous claim shows that $W \neq V$, so V has a basis $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{B} \cap W = \varnothing$. Therefore $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}^*_{-1}(x,v) = \varnothing$ and since $\mathcal{B} \subseteq V^\#$ we have that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{-1}(x,v)$ as required.

For $(x,v) \in \mathcal{C}$ we write $\Pi_{x,v}$ for the basis delivered by (4). For $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ set

$$R_\alpha := [Z_\alpha, Z_{v-1}].$$

Since Q_α is the unique Sylow 2-subgroup of $\mathrm{C}_{G_\alpha}(Z_\alpha)$, by Proposition 3.4, and $Z_{v-1} \not\leqslant Q_\alpha$, as $(\alpha, v-1)$ is a critical pair, we have that $R_\alpha \neq 1$. Note that $R_\alpha \leq Z_\alpha \cap Z_{v-1}$ and is therefore centralised by Q_α and Q_{v-1}. The figure below indicates the position of the vertices we have defined.

(5) For $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ we have $R_\alpha \leqslant Z_x$.

Since $(\alpha, v-1)$ is a critical pair, Proposition 3.6(i) yields $G_\alpha \cap G_x = Z_{v-1}Q_\alpha$ so

$$R_\alpha \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha \cap G_x) = Z_{x\alpha} \leqslant Z_x$$

by Proposition 3.6(iii).

(6) There exists $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ such that $R_\alpha \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$.

Suppose this is not the case and that for each $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ we have $R_\alpha \not\leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$. Since $(\alpha, v-1)$ is a critical pair, we have that $G_\alpha \cap G_x = Q_\alpha Z_{v-1}$ centralises R_α (since $R_\alpha \leqslant Z_\alpha \cap Z_{v-1}$). Since $b > 1$ we have that $Z_v \leqslant Q_{v-1} \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{G_{v-1}}(Z_{v-1})$, by Proposition 3.4. Then as $R_\alpha \leqslant Z_{v-1}$ it follows that R_α is centralised by Z_v, and therefore by $Z_vQ_x = G_x \cap G_{x+1}$ (since (6) shows $R_\alpha \leqslant Z_x$). Thus R_α is centralised by $C_\alpha := \langle G_x \cap G_{x+1}, G_x \cap G_\alpha \rangle$.

Pick $D_\alpha \in \mathrm{Syl}_3(C_\alpha)$ (so $D_\alpha \cong \mathrm{C}_3$). Since $n \geqslant 2$, Lemma 3.8 implies that $[Q_xD_\alpha, Z_x] = 1$. Now $C := \langle Q_xD_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi_{x,v} \rangle$ centralises Z_x, and by our definition of $\Pi_{x,v}$ we see C contains

a Sylow 3-subgroup of G_x, and so transitive on $\Gamma(x)$, contradicting Proposition 3.4.

For each $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ we apply (4) to $\mathcal{C}_{-1}(\alpha, v-1)$ which gives $\Pi_{\alpha,v-1}$. Then we apply (6) to $\Pi_{\alpha,v-1}$ which yields $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_{-1}(\alpha, v-1)$ such that

$$1 \neq R_\sigma = [Z_\sigma, Z_{v-2}] \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha)$$

and we let Σ be the set of vertices obtained. We indicated below where the vertices in Σ lie.



(7) For all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ we have $R_\sigma \leqslant Z_x$.

We have that $R_\sigma \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_\sigma}(Q_\sigma Z_{v-2}) = Z_\sigma \cap Z_\alpha$, by Proposition 3.6(i) and (iii). Now since $b > 1$ we have that $Z_{v-1} \leqslant Q_{v-2}$ and so $[Z_{v-1}, R_\sigma] \leqslant [Q_{v-2}, Z_{v-2}] = 1$, by Proposition 3.4. Hence $R_\sigma \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(Q_\alpha Z_{v-1}) = \mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha \cap G_x) = Z_\alpha \cap Z_x$, by Proposition 3.6(i) and (iii).

(8) For all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ we have $[Z_v, R_\sigma] = 1$.

The assumption $b > 2$ implies that $Z_v \leqslant Q_{v-2}$, and therefore Z_v centralises Z_{v-2} which contains R_σ.

(9) There is some $\sigma \in \Sigma$ such that R_σ is centralised by G_x.

Assume the claim is false. Then for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ by (7) we have $R_\sigma \not\leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$. Let $\sigma \in \Sigma$ be arbitrary. By (7) and Proposition 3.4, we see that R_σ is centralised by Q_x. Using (9) we see that R_σ is centralised by $C_\sigma := \langle Q_x Z_v, G_x \cap G_\alpha \rangle$. Pick $D_\sigma \in \mathrm{Syl}_3(C_\sigma)$. Then $|D_\sigma| = 3$ and since $n \geqslant 2$, Lemma 3.8 implies $[D_\sigma, Z_x] = 1$. Now $D := \langle Q_x D_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \rangle$ centralises Z_x and by the definition of $\Pi_{x,v}$ we see that D contains a Sylow 3-subgroup of G_x. Therefore D is a transitive subgroup of G_x, a contradiction to Proposition 3.4.

(10) A contradiction.

By (9) there is $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\alpha \in \Pi_{x,v}$ such that $1 \neq R_\sigma \leqslant \mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha) \cap \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$. However, $\mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha) \cap \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x)$ is centralised by $\langle G_\alpha, G_x \rangle$ and contained in $G_\alpha \cap G_x$, so Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\mathrm{C}_{Z_\alpha}(G_\alpha) \cap \mathrm{C}_{Z_x}(G_x) = 1,$$

a contradiction which completes the proof. □

Theorem 1.1 now follows from Theorem 3.10 and the lemma below.

Lemma 3.11. *The group $G_x^{[b+2]}$ is trivial for all $x \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary vertex of Γ and choose v so that $(x, v) \in \mathcal{C}$. As in Remark 3.9 we identify the set $\Gamma(v)$ with V so that $v-1$ is identified with $\underline{0}$. For each $w \in V^{\#}$ we have $G_w^{[b+2]} \leqslant G_x^{[1]} = Q_x$, so by Proposition 3.4, $[Z_x, G_w^{[b+2]}] = 1$. Now $(x, v) \in \mathcal{C}$ implies that Z_x induces an involution on $\Gamma(v)$ (which fixes $\underline{0}$). We have therefore that the action of Z_x on $V^{\#}$ is the map

$$w \mapsto -w.$$

Since Z_x centralises $G_w^{[b+2]}$, for $w \in V^{\#}$ we have

$$G_w^{[b+2]} = G_{-w}^{[b+2]}.$$

For $w \in V^{\#}$ the set $B_w := \{\underline{0}, w, -w\}$ is a block for the action of G_v on $\Gamma(v)$ and G_{B_w} is 2-transitive on B_w. This implies that

$$G_w^{[b+2]} = G_{-w}^{[b+2]} = G_{\underline{0}}^{[b+2]}.$$

Since this is true for all $w \in V^{\#}$, $G_{\underline{0}}^{[b+2]}$ is normalised by G_v. Now we see that

$$G_{\underline{0}}^{[b+2]} \lhd \langle G_v, G_{\underline{0}} \rangle$$

hence $G_{\underline{0}}^{[b+2]} = 1$ by Lemma 3.1(a). □

Remark 3.12. The proof shows that $G_x^{[4]} = 1$, we would like to know if there exist examples with $G_x^{[3]} \neq 1$. The largest examples of which the authors are aware have $|G_x| = 144$, $|G_x^{[1]}| = 8$, $|G_x^{[2]}| = 2$ and $|G_x^{[3]}| = 1$.

References

[1] Á. Bereczky, A. Maróti, On groups with every normal subgroup transitive or semiregular, J. Algebra 319 (2008) 1733–1751.

[2] A. Delgado, D. Goldschmidt, B. Stellmacher, Groups and graphs: new results and methods. DMV Seminar, 6. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1985.

[3] A. Gardiner, Arc-transitivity in graphs, Quart. J. Math. Oxford 24 (1973) 399–407.

[4] D. M. Goldschmidt, Automorphisms of Trivalent Graphs, Ann. of Math. (2) 111 (1980), no. 2, 377–407.

[5] H. Kurzweil, B. Stellmacher, The theory of finite groups. An introduction. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.

[6] C. W. Parker, P. Rowley, Symplectic amalgams. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2002.

[7] C.E. Praeger, Finite quasiprimitive group actions on graphs and designs, in: Young Gheel Baik, David L. Johnson, Ann Chi Kim (Eds.), Groups – Korea, de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2000, pp. 319–331.

[8] C. E. Praeger, L. Pyber, P. Spiga, E. Szabó, Graphs with automorphism groups admitting composition factors of bounded rank. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012), no. 7, 2307–2318.

[9] C. E. Praeger, P. Spiga, G. Verret, Bounding the size of a vertex-stabiliser in a finite vertex-transitive graph. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 102 (2012), no. 3, 797–819.

[10] P. Potočnik, P. Spiga, G. Verret, On graph-restrictive permutation groups. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 102 (2012), no. 3, 820–831.

[11] A. Q. Sami, Locally dihedral amalgams of odd type. J. Algebra 298 (2006) 630–644.

[12] J-P. Serre, Trees. Translated from the French original by John Stillwell. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
[13] P. Spiga, Two local conditions on the vertex stabiliser of arc-transitive graphs and their effect on the Sylow subgroups. J. Group Theory 15 (2012), no. 1, 23–35.
[14] P. Spiga, G. Verret, On intransitive graph-restrictive groups. to appear in J. Algebraic Combin. doi:10.1007/s10801-013-0482-5.
[15] V. I. Trofimov, Stabilizers of the vertices of graphs with projective suborbits. Soviet Math. Dokl., 42 (1991), 825–828.
[16] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits, Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math., 39 (1992), 869–894.
[17] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Cases of small characteristics. I. Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math., 45 (1995), 353–398.
[18] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Cases of small characteristics. II. Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math., 45 (1995), 559–576.
[19] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Exceptional cases of characteristic 2. I. Izv. Math., 62 (1998), 1221–1279.
[20] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Exceptional cases of characteristic 2. II. Izv. Math., 64 (2000), 173–192.
[21] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Exceptional cases of characteristic 2. III. Izv. Math., 65 (2001), 787–822.
[22] V. I. Trofimov, Graphs with projective suborbits. Exceptional cases of characteristic 2. IV. Izv. Math., 67 (2003), 1267–1294.
[23] V. I. Trofimov, R. M. Weiss, Graphs with a locally linear group of automorphisms. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 118 (1995), no. 2, 191–206.
[24] V. I. Trofimov, R. M. Weiss, The group $E_6(q)$ and graphs with a locally linear group of automorphisms. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 148 (2010), no. 1, 1–32.
[25] W. T. Tutte, A family of cubical graphs. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 43 (1947), 459–474.
[26] W. T. Tutte, On the symmetry of cubic graphs. Canad. J. Math. 11 (1959), 621–624.
[27] G. Verret, On the order of arc-stabilisers in arc-transitive graphs. Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 80 (2009), 498–505.
[28] R. Weiss, s-transitive graphs. Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai 25 (1978) 827–847.
[29] R. Weiss, On a theorem of Goldschmidt. Ann. of Math. (2) 126 (1987), no. 2, 429–438.

School of Mathematics and Statistics (M019), University of Western Australia, Crawley, 6009, Australia

E-mail address: michael.giudici@uwa.edu.au

E-mail address: luke.morgan@uwa.edu.au